

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed April 28, 2006 has been received and reviewed.

Applicants have received and reviewed the final Office Action mailed April 28, 2006. Applicants thank the Examiner for his indication that Claims 7 and 17-20 contain allowable subject matter. Applicants note that Claims 1-20 are pending in the application and that Claims 1-6, 8-16, and 18-20 have been rejected. Applicants address these rejections in the foregoing amendments and the remarks set forth below.

SECTION 112 REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected Claims 13-15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. With regard to Claim 13, Applicants have made amendments such that it depends from Claim 12 and clarified that it is the “first” angle of inclination. Claims 14 and 15 depend from 13 and therefore are also clarified. Claim 18 has been amended such that it depends correctly from Claim 12. Antecedent basis is provided in Claim 12 for the elements recited in Claim 18. Claim 19 has been amended in a manner suggested by the Examiner. Since Claim 20 was somewhat duplicative of Claim 19, Applicants have deleted one phrase of Claim 19 that was repeated in Claim 20.

SECTION 102 REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-5, 8, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Simmons. The Examiner has also rejected Claims 1 and 6 under Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Bonmartini. These rejections are moot as Applicants have cancelled Claims 1-6 and 8-11.

SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). As mentioned above, Claim 9 has been cancelled.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner has specifically indicated that Claims 7 and 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicants have amended Claim 7 as suggested by the Examiner such that it is now in independent form. However, with regard to Claim 17, Applicants have not amended as it depends from Claim 12. In fact, Applicants believe that Claims 12-18 are in condition for allowance, Claims 13 and 18 having been amended to overcome the Section 112 rejections. Applicants note that the Examiner has not set forth any specific rejections of these claims or arguments why they should not be allowed. To the contrary, Claim 12 sets forth an endless drive track with traction lugs having lower and upper portions with first and second angles of inclination. The art cited by the Examiner does not show any such traction lugs with dual angles inclination on lower and upper portions. Even the new art cited by the Examiner does not show outwardly extending lugs with such first and second angles of inclination. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claims 12-18, as amended, define over the prior art and are in condition for allowance.

Claims 19 and 20 have been amended as outlined above.

CONCLUSION

Applicants realize that the Office Action was made final. Applicants have, herein, amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner to place them in condition for allowance. The only exception is with regard to independent Claim 12 and the claims depending there from which the Examiner did not specifically address in the final Office Action. However, as stated above, Applicants believe that these claims are also in condition for allowance according to the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe the claims to be in condition for immediate allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned to resolve any questions or concerns that may be resolved by a telephone conference.

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM^{PLLC}



Darren J. Jones
Registration No. 36,175
Direct Dial: 206.957.2490